

Executive Committee
2/12/04
Sue Jameson Room, 3:00-5:00

Present: Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Robert McNamara, Rick Luttmann, Ruben Armiñana, Brigitte Lahme, Eduardo Ochoa, Robert Coleman-Senghor

Absent: Catherine Nelson

Guests: Steve Wilson, Jason Spencer

M. Dreisbach chaired for C. Nelson. C. Nelson was attending a statewide Chairs meeting in Sacramento.

Agenda – Jason Spencer, President of Associated Students asked to speak to the body. Joint Doctoral Program from the School of Education added to the agenda. *Approved.*

Minutes of 1/29/04 emailed – R. McNamara noted the addition of “temporary nature of original request” needed to be added to his remarks on page 10. *Approved as corrected.*

Correspondence: None

No Chair report due to C. Nelson’s absence.

Reports

President Armiñana

R. Armiñana said the Governor has mentioned that he will do the May revise in April. He will present most, but not all, of what the Governor does in the May revise. He will present that to the Legislature by mid-April. There will probably be some revenue expectations that are one month short. He’s hoping to force the Legislature to deal with the budget by the end of May and ratify by the end of June, plus. Will this happen? Who knows? This is in the arena of minor miracles, but that is what the Governor intends to do. So things might move in a more accelerated way than it normally has. In terms of that, Higher Education is intended to be the political football used by the Legislature during this budget matters. Clearly, the Democrats are highly concerned that K-12 is off of the table. They don’t believe that Health and Welfare truly are good political footballs. But that Higher Education is. Especially as it refers to access. Denying access to 20,000 qualified students has political legs. Especially if their major strategy is to create the conditions for a tax increase, even though the tax increase would be at the most \$2.3 billion versus \$14 billion deficit, that’s assuming 57 and 58 passes, they are very aware that tax increases are small fee, but politically they feel that it represents a great deal of political coverage for their constituencies. Interestingly enough if there is a tax increase, which is doubtful, we in Higher Education would see zero from it because 50% would go to K-12 under Proposition 98 and the other 50% would go to Health and Welfare, therefore we will be the political football but we don’t get anything by

being the political football. R. Arminana said he has never played football, but has seen football in play and no matter how wins, the ball gets always dirty. He thinks that will happen to us. This concern about access by the entire Legislature could have significant negative impact on the CSU, because we might be forced to take the students and not get paid for it. Nobody is talking about increasing resources. They might be talking about increasing students without the resources to teach those students. Therefore in effect we would have more severe cuts than we have now. That will play out. He's pretty sure the Board in March will consider a fee increase which is a slight variation of the one proposed by the Governor where the undergraduate fee will go by 11% rather than 10% but teacher credentialing will go by 25% instead of 40%, graduates 40% and non-resident by 20% in addition. This is revenue neutral. The administration is willing to consider a revenue neutral proposal and what happens is that undergraduate growing 1% subsidizes by 15% teacher credentialing. He thinks that will probably come to the Board at the March meeting in Fresno. That for the time being is what he knows.

R. Luttmann said the last he heard from the Chancellor was that he was in effect drawing a line in the sand and saying we can't let quality erode anymore and so any budget cuts will be met by enrollment decreases. What is the status of that? R. Armiñana responded that it is still the policy of the Chancellor and probably the policy of the Trustees, but remember they are agents of the Legislature and the Governor. The line is in the sand, but it is somebody else who controls the sand. R. Luttmann said but they are making it clear to the Legislature that this is their view? R. Armiñana said yes, as late as Monday afternoon it was expressed face to face by the Chancellor and the Chairman of the Board to the Governor who was highly sympathetic and understanding. Again, we have a separation of powers and the Legislature does have significant say over our destiny even more than that of the University of California who technically is a constitutional power separate of equal standing as of the other (unintelligible). The answer is yes, that's clear but we have little control all the same.

R. Coleman-Senghor said it's reported that San Diego State had moved to take all their remedial courses off campus. Does SSU have any plans to move in a similar direction with respect to generating saving for our campus? R. Armiñana said he had not discussed this with anyone and it was news to him. It is not a plan at this moment. He didn't know what it would mean or what the resources are for those students who are accepted and need remediation. It might be worth looking at it, but at this moment he does not have any firm policy direction on this issue. R. Coleman-Senghor said there are also a couple of campuses looking to using the JC's located in their areas to have student take some of their introductory courses, he wondered if were any plans of a similar nature at SSU. R. Armiñana responded that there is in the Governor's a proposal that 10% of students be referred to the community colleges and if they do, their fees are waived at the community colleges and then upon full completion of their two years, then they are admitted at the CSU, guaranteed admission. In the conversations that he has heard we are not sure how to do that as a system. We're not sure how the much the community colleges are willing to accept that. A lot of the issues deal with institutional (unintelligible due to coughing) of each other and therefore we might be able to suggest to students to do that. He's not sure how we can force them to do that unless they're not accepted

period. We can redirect those not being accepted because we have hit our maximum and we have no knowledge of how we can force the community colleges to accept those student and provide those services unless there was a legislative mandate to do that and he doesn't have any knowledge of that happening. There is no advantage financially to the community colleges to do that. They get paid equally if they take a student who plans to transfer or they take a student who wants to learn automotive mechanics. There is no incentive for them, they are not judged on accountability measures about the number of transfer students, etc. At this moment he doesn't see incentives for the structure to do that in any real way. R. Coleman-Senghor said the reason he was posing the question is that a number our students, on their own, those that haven't been able to get into classes, they have very often taken a course simultaneously at the JC. He was just thinking if we are exploring ways in which we can, if this is a statewide crisis then, in effect acknowledging the autonomy of each of the institutions, and since in effect our Master Plan does call for students taking courses at the JC, lower division courses, he was wondering if we could begin an exploration of the way in which students could take those course in a much more organized way at the JC. R. Armiñana responded that is it true historically that students in the CSU have taken courses at community colleges when they have not been able to take that course at a CSU campus and this happens throughout the state. One of the problems that exists to be very honest, between the community colleges and the CSU is there's no guarantee unless there is a clear articulation agreement between campus X and campus Y to do that. We do not have a system to system articulation between the community colleges and the CSU or the UC, so while you can attempt to do it on a local basis, systemwide is not there. So the students have to be sure if they take X course it is going to truly transfer. Sometimes a course will transfer to X campus in the CSU, but not to Y campus in the CSU. That's a major issue and he wouldn't be surprised to see in this legislative session some legislator forcing legislatively that articulation between the universities and the community colleges. One of the problems that happens in the community college is there are 104 different autonomous separate units. We don't have the ability to negotiate between two systems, because we can with some limitations we could negotiate as a system, but they even though they have a system in principle, it is a system that does not have the ability legally or practically to negotiate on behalf of the 104 separate jurisdictions. It adds to the complexity. E. Ochoa said he wanted to add a footnote to the President's comment on this issue. There is an initiative that has gone through a number of incarnations and the latest one is now being actively managed by the Academic Senate in collaboration with the Chancellor's office and the discipline's department chairs to try to achieve at least consistency at the lower division among the majors in the CSU. This will allow us to eventually have a single course description to submit to CAN program so those community colleges will have a single standard to target in their own curriculum. So there are some efforts being made in this area, but it will be awhile before we get some real results. R. Armiñana said this Schwarzenegger administration is heavily imprinted by Florida and would like to have in California that ability of easy transfer between community colleges and the comprehensives or universities. They would like to have common course numbers, the ability to redirect significant numbers of students in the lower division to the community colleges. That happens in Florida, it happens in Texas and other states where you have much more structure to the community colleges than here and you have a very clear path of transfer which is the AA degree. In

California, the AA degree in terms of being the path to transfer is simply meaningless. Therefore, he thinks the intention is there, but it's going to take a lot of work over a long time to achieve that and to be very honest he suspects up to now there has been a significant level of reluctance from the community colleges, especially the community college Senate to accept that including the AA degree. They believe that it would be detrimental to their interest and would create a two class structure in the community college. One would be the transfer population and the other the vocational population and up to this moment the community college have not been willing participants to engage in that discussion. They might be forced to it, probably legislation would be required. He understands that several of the soon to be termed out Senators, like Dee Dee Alpert and John Vasconcellos might be interested in going there, but it's not going to happen without a lot of resistance from the faculty of the community college and a significant level of apathy from the administration of the community colleges. M. Dreisbach asked if at the Senate the President would report on the status of the technology high school space.

Provost report

E. Ochoa said he would mention one tidbit from the Academic Affairs Council he attended yesterday. We will be receiving soon a communication from the Chancellor's office that will require us to not admit certain categories of students as an partial alternative response to the Governor's budget call to redirect 10% of the first time freshman and those four categories are: lower division transfers, upper division transfers that have not completed their GE, second baccalaureate, and unclassified post baccalaureate. Interestingly enough the first two categories we don't admit here. The third category has some caveats for areas of critical need which will include Nursing, but the remainder of disciplines that might fall under that exemption are in the process of being identified now by the Chancellor's office. In the fourth category we will require a change in procedure by the School of Ed in particular which typically admits post-bac as unclassified pending a review of their application at which point it would be made either conditionally classified or fully classified. That will imply just an administrative change in terms of how that's handled. So we don't expect much of an impact on this campus.

R. Luttmann asked about some talk recently about a change regarding the ability of students to take a course a second time and have their grade expunged. What he has heard is that under this proposal students would not be allowed to do that if they had gotten an unofficial withdrawal. He wondered if this was true or the status of any such proposal. E. Ochoa asked what an unofficial withdrawal was. R. Luttmann said it is a grade students get if they simply disappear. Traditionally it's been considered pretty similar to an F, it counts zero in their GPA, the principle difference is they have not actually taken exams and flunked them, they just disappear, an unofficial withdrawal. In the past students have been able to take a course a second time and have that expunged. If that's going to change we'd like to know about and it's something the Senate would want to talk about. E. Ochoa said he would have to look into that. E. McDonald said she believed that the University Standards Committee is looking at this issue, but she's not sure what the status is. We don't have a representative on University Standards at the moment. B. Lahme said they

are also picking it up in the Student Affairs committee as well. It's one example of the communication concerning advising, so we'll be talking a little bit more about that. R. Coleman-Senghor asked has there been a change? B. Lahme said she thinks it's a transition this semester. So by the end semester of the Registrar will treat it as something that can't be replaced, but this semester she thought it still could be. R. Coleman-Senghor said that in effect a policy has been put in place and we as faculty don't know about it. B. Lahme said if you are new faculty you know about it because at one of the new faculty lunches the Registrar talked about it. R. Coleman-Senghor said and if you're an alert faculty and read all the bulletins you know about it. N. Byrne said he was very surprised. Is there not a process whereby faculty input is obtained prior to make this change. This is really a substantial change. E. McDonald said she believed that these are issues the University Standards committee was charged with ultimately. The Chair of the University Standards committee has been looking at the charge from the Senate to the University Standards committee or from EPC, concerning what exactly the University Standards committee do and what is it they have control over. At this point that committee has not really done more than approve petitions to withdraw or add or change and she thinks they are trying to reassert control over the process and this is one of the issues they are looking at. She thinks they are looking at all the policies to decide what role the faculty should have in reviewing those policies.

M. Dreisbach asked the Provost about the so-called "doomsday schedule" we've been working on our departments that she would rename for the moment "bare bones," is that the schedule that we will probably be mounting to begin with? E. Ochoa said we don't really know. Until March 2 we don't even have a clue. If the bond measure passes and if the Governor's budget emerges unscathed from the legislative process, then we will probably be faced with the magnitude of cuts that we are trying to determine in terms of what impact they would have on us. What we're engaged in trying to mount a schedule yet, we're trying to work through the implications of a cut of this magnitude and we have two end points in terms of an inclusive range, a range of viable schedules for us is a subset of that larger range that he tried to bracket with those two end points. And how small a subset it is will depend on the what we get back from the Schools in terms of what impact these end points would have. He thought it was fair to say that the lower end point is one that envisions the FTE driven portion of the cut, one directly linked to the 348 FTE reduction, those would go to the Schools and then the remainder of the cuts, the best case scenario, which we probably can't achieve, would be to make that pro-rated across the entire division. Just looking at the numbers that would result from a pro-rated distribution for ESAS, the Library and his office, those numbers are clearly represent an aspirational goal, not one we could achieve. So what remains in the Schools under the lower limits in that scenario in the aggregate at least, is the lower bound. How it will be distributed between Schools will depend on the information we get back. Some schools may not even be able to handle that. So we'll have to look at the specifics of how programs would be impacted, our ability to mount schedules, the need for certain programs to have certain course taught and so forth. We're just going through iterations at this point. M. Dreisbach asked but is there a directive out from your office about the timing of these things because meanwhile the departments are meeting, they are developing schedules, they're making room assignments based on a very bare bones, no FERP, no adjunct schedule. E. Ochoa

said if you think about the ultimate schedule we put in place as one of consisting of layers, we're sort of laying the bottom layer, with no FERPs, no part-timers and that's where the question is that won't be enough in certain cases. But at least that much can be put in place because that's what's going to get done. In a sense we're going to be late no matter how we do this. In another sense, we're way too early. We don't have anything like the kind of information we need to be able to draw up a schedule that has a reasonable chance of sticking. On the other hand if we wait until we have that kind of information, we'd be waiting on the legislature. M. Dreisbach said it's putting the rooms together with that, that makes it critical.

E. Stanny asked about how the Provost determined the end points of the range. The end point where instruction gets it all, is that what you're calling the high end point or the low end point? E. Ochoa said that's the upper limit on the impact it could have on the Schools. E. Stanny said the lower end point still seems pretty horrible for the Schools because then they're not getting their fair share of it, so what is the constraint there? Is that the permanent faculty? E. Ochoa said yes. R. Coleman-Senghor said he heard very clearly from the President's presentation about how the budget is going to unfold that in fact we may not know how this is going to shake out until we're graduating our students in May, if we're lucky. It seems to him that he's heard Provost Ochoa time and again say to us that these are models and he has been taking them as scenarios. What he thinks that the faculty needs is the bare bones scenario because you can always build from that. But it seems to him even as we are talking about the bare bones, there seems to be a marrow to the bone that we also might be talking about. Namely that after we've (unintelligible) this stage, that's already built in the assumption that we're going to be getting the benefits from the passage of 57. So the question then becomes for him as a faculty member and a member of this body why aren't we preparing in part for no passage of the proposition because the information that's coming to him, that's coming from the polls, is showing that this not going to be a done deal by any means. There's a good change that it may not pass. E. Ochoa said that if it does not pass we will be in an environment that it's total uncertainty. He thought it was Kane who distinguished between risk and uncertainty. Under risk you can plan, you have confidence intervals, under uncertainty, you don't know, you have not clue and that's basically what would happen. We don't know if that's going to lead to . . . suddenly taxes might become an option, but then maybe not. The President thinks that what's going to happen then is we'll have both taxes and more expensive debt for the State and therefore deeper cuts as well. R. Coleman-Senghor said he was more interested in how we could position our faculty to be ready for a certain kind of response. He's almost reluctant to ask faculty members to do anymore than the bare bones, but on the other hand I think that they should look at the upper range and the lower range in terms of preparation. There are still people in our faculty who believe that we will be able to retain some part-timers and then there are newer faculty who are very concerned about whether or not they are going to be here in the Fall. We have to at least have some clearer notion of what can be occurring for them.

Chair-Elect report

M. Dreisbach gave a brief report. Structure and Functions is now looking at the Faculty Consultation on Budgetary Matters policy and she brought this to the

Executive Committee before who sent it to the Senate Budget committee and now the SBC has asked S&F to really take the time to work on that. We are trying to revise it, update it and then we'll bring it back to the Senate Budget committee and back to the Executive Committee. Regarding the upcoming election, directions for how to vote have gone out. Nominations closed this past Monday. We have people running for every single position with some choice. Ballot statements are up on the web now. Voting starts on Monday, February 16th at 8:00am and closes on February 22 at midnight. R. Armiñana asked who the candidates were. L. Holmstrom responded for Chair-Elect, Elizabeth Stanny and Bob Coleman-Senghor; for Secretary Jan Beaulyn, for At-Large Melissa Vandever, John Sullins and Noel Byrne, for Statewide Phil McGough and Robert McNamara, for Lecturer Senators Helmut Wautischer and Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Senate Budget Committee. . R. Luttmann asked about Michael Pinkston. L. Holmstrom said she was waiting for him to totally verify his candidacy. Senate Budget committee is Andy Merrifield and Michael Ezra and URTP is Bill Poe, Rick Marks and Susan Stewart.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report

L. Furukawa-Schlereth brought a treat from his vacation to Hawaii for the body. He gave an update on the Technology High School. It turns out that three or four months ago the Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School district in preparation for their budget planning for four or five years came to the conclusion that they were facing very significant budget cuts, mostly as a fault of falling enrollments because the number of families in Rohnert Park with school age children are falling due to the cost of housing, what have you, so they are facing very, very significant budget reductions and they are looking at all sorts of things they might do to manage their budget. They called the campus to ascertain what the reaction would be in the institution to move the Technology High School from the campus and perhaps consolidate the curriculum of the Technology High School with the Rancho Cotati High School because they simply couldn't afford (unintelligible) given the falling enrollments in the district in general and specifically within the Tech High to maintain both. It will be their call. They are entitled to the space in Salazar Hall for twenty more years. They've been with us for five years and they did provide us with \$5 million which gives them the right to use those square feet for another twenty years. We don't have an ability to rebate the money. So we communicated all that to them and they've been struggling with it internally. It is his understanding that last Tuesday night at their School Board meeting they surfaced the idea that they were potentially planning to close the Technology High School and consolidate it. That set off a bit of a firestorm. He knows families that have students that are enrolled in the Tech High School. They deferred the item until the 24th of February when they will take action. We'll see what they do. They may leave, they may stay. It's unclear. We have said to them that if they were to leave, as you all know, a completely unrelated item, the campus has bit of space problem for the next two years with the Darwin remodel. The university is clearly not pushing the High School out and that appears to be clarified now in people's minds. We'll see what happens on the 24th.

R. Luttmann asked does the fine print of our contract with the School District say anything about canceling it? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that there is some fine print in the license agreement that says that if by some chance we kick them out, by some

chance there was an earthquake or a fire in Salazar hall or other disaster, we are obligated to find them some space on campus. But the license agreement is silent on their departure. It does not give them the right to sublet the space to another entity, so we're protected. So there's no out for them. R. Luttmann said he was surprised then that they are even considering it because presumably the biggest expense of running a school is the physical plant and they've already got that. If they are going to consolidate it at another school they're still going to have to have the teachers and so on, so where is the savings that would result to them. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he really couldn't say. He said he thinks they're planning to consolidate the administrative overhead of the school with one of their other schools and perhaps save some money. He said he wasn't knowledgeable about their internal budget issues.

R. Coleman-Senghor said since the contract reads that they can't sublet the space that doesn't mean that's it's ours by contract then. It means that what we're going to be doing is renting the space from them. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said it may not be that space, it probably would be but the institution, if they do have excess space somewhere in the School District, it might be more economical for the university to consider renting that space rather than bringing portable laboratories to campus thereby helping them on one level and perhaps reducing our costs because the portables are quite expensive. That was the conversation we had with them, but that's a secondary set of discussions. They need to make the decision first whether they are going or not. R. Armiñana said one of the issues they are facing is that supposed we were to rent that space from them. They probably cannot use those proceeds for operational costs. They will have to use it for physical costs because it came from a bond issue. At the end of the day they may not be able to capture any money. They are not poor in capital money. As a matter of fact you will find from Proposition 55, many schools in this area there will be a number of schools that will not access Proposition 55 money that they are entitled to because their enrollments are going down. They are poor in operations. Which sounds like our history too. R. Coleman-Senghor said he heard from a parent of one of the students today that the university was kicking them out. It sounds like that's been corrected? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said R. Armiñana was out of town and so was E. Ochoa, so when the letter hit the families, it went all the way to Long Beach and the university was quite distraught that the superintendent characterized it in his letter, that that university was pushing the district. There's absolutely no truth to that, it's completely the other way. The most recent letter clarifying from the superintendent makes that clear. But you're right, it was very irritating frankly.

Business

Jason Spencer, President of Association Students

J. Spencer said the first question – last year as he sat on the Senate, N. Byrne was a fantastic resource for the students and brought information from the Executive Committee and the top levels of the faculty to give students some perspective and this year we had talked to Chair Nelson early and no one was able to do it. Then Bruce Peterson sat which brought a great student affairs/SSP, perspective to us, but not really the meat of faculty governance and issues. He came to make a second

appeal to see if there was anyone. He's going to try to come to some of these meetings, but sometimes he can't. Is there any possibility there's someone who can do that for us? It doesn't have to be someone from this committee. We have Rand Link and the Student Affairs perspective on the Board already, so bringing in another SSP or ESAS position is redundant and we're definitely missing faculty given the magnitude of what's going to happen over the next few months. It would be good to have that communication open. M. Dreisbach asked when the Board meets. J. Spencer said Mondays from noon to two. M. Dreisbach said she was willing to share it with someone. B. Lahme said she could also help out. The meetings are in the MPR. S. Wilson asked if these were open meetings. J. Spencer said everyone is welcome. Second issue – The AS wants to do sometime in March a teach-in. We're hoping to call it Budget 101: University System in Crisis and really get all players involved and get the information out to students what's going on. Hopefully, have faculty governance involved, have CFA bring a perspective, have the administration bring a perspective and just spend a few hours one day with different people doing different workshops on different issues and see if we can get the students to come out and really be interested. The tentative dates that we've set are March 22, 23 and 24th. The 22nd is a Monday and we have our AS Senate meeting scheduled for outside in the Quad that day and our goal is have an action item of a resolution on the budget, what the students feel action could be at the university level, the State level and the Federal level to get support for higher education throughout. We hope to get lots of student input on that before as a discussion item and then the goal is to really advertise it and get the students out there en masse on Monday. Tuesday, the 23rd we'd do the teach-in, if that works and then if all came together we're hoping statewide to do rallies on Wednesday and make it a big media event and give the Governor's revise a good hit in the media showing that the CSU should be a priority. Or that Higher Education should be a priority. R. McNamara asked if these were noon events. J. Spencer responded that for the teach-in they figured 10-2 is tentative. We discussed it at our Executive committee and we're willing to put resources into it. We really don't have the budget, but all of our Executives are going to pull out of their stipends for the month and we're going to use that to have the funding to do it. It's a good PR move and a good move to get people out there and it's the only way we can do it. M. Dreisbach thanked J. Spencer from bringing the item and said that the body will think about it and see about getting back to him for participation. R. Armiñana said that on March 10th there is a budget summit on Long Beach. The Chair of each Academic Senate probably received a letter today. The Chair of the Associated Students of each campus probably received a letter today. And the Presidents. The other people invited are the Executive Committee of the Systemwide Senate and the head of each union.

Draft Vision and Mission Statement from AASPC

M. Dreisbach introduced the item. **R. Coleman-Senghor moved to forward the statement to the Senate. Second. Vote – passed on voice vote.**

Course Outline Policy – E. Stanny

E. Stanny reported that the Course Outline Policy passed FSAC unanimously. The reason we came up with a course outline policy is that in the course catalog there's a

discussion of course requirements and it refers to a syllabus policy which doesn't exist and so we thought that one should exist and we came up with one. This is what we came up with. R. Luttmann said he was aware of two other bodies on campus that have some interest in this. One is the Campus Climate committee which has proposed that course outlines should contain a reference to the Diversity Vision Statement that we have adopted and the other party of interest is the General Education committee which would like at least in the General Education courses to have some reference to the General Education mission statement. He's not a spokesman for these people and just thought there might be parties that would be interested in expanding this. R. McNamara voiced concern about the length. For instance, just the cheating and plagiarism policy, that's big there, and he knows some may have a link to the site, but that really doesn't address it. He's concerned that we're over directing here. He thinks all the on the list are important, but was concerned about the length. It's going to be a lot of paper if nothing else. E. McDonald asked where did FSAC come up with these ideas? Did they look at other syllabus policies? E. Stanny said they looked at what was in the catalog course requirements policies and we incorporated some of that in here and we also looked at other CSU's course outline policies. R. Coleman-Senghor said he would like this to be re-visited. You can make a statement about diversity, you can make a statement about race and a whole range of things that are be "supposed to be" on that syllabus. In fact it is clearly stated in our catalog and also in some classes, we have a plagiarism statement there, we have a plagiarism policy and any faculty member whose teaching should have that as part of what s/he does. We can end up with a lot of different things in this. He didn't think the document was ready the way it is right now. It needs to be looked at by GE. It would be much more relevant if in the course it's indicated whether it's a GE course or not. So that is directly related to curriculum issues. His syllabus right now has gone from, when he first got here, from two pages now to seven. The striking thing about this is that students will turn around and say what are we reading tomorrow. There should be some information about the course itself, and information about what the course does and does not due in respect to the curriculum itself. E. Ochoa said he's afraid that in this litigious era the course syllabus has become in fact an implicit contract between the student and the university. That's why it's a good idea to be inclusive and exhaustive about the student's responsibilities and expectations that you have for them and so forth. Some of that could be done by reference to putting a link to a webpage. But it's good practice to cover ourselves in that document. R. McNamara said he recently he went through a plagiarism process and one of the first things said was do you have a plagiarism statement in your syllabus. I did not, but in his first day of class he gives the whole spiel on plagiarism, what it is, what it means, what the guidelines are and he thought, maybe naively, was that when they come into the university it's stated right there what the consequences are for plagiarism, so he thought we were covered from a legal point of view. Maybe not, maybe that's what you're telling us that this is added protection. He almost felt it insulting to students to put a statement on plagiarism on every syllabus. M. Dreisbach said her syllabi as well have grown to 7 or 8 pages and she finds the more she puts in them the less they are read, but at least it's in writing and she can refer to it. There are a few things missing here, for instance, policy on attendance, absence if it affects a grade. E. Stanny said attendance was in the document. M. Dreisbach continued how about policy on late submission of material or requirements? That comes up quite

frequently and student want to know if they are getting credit and if you don't have anything in your syllabus as a penalty, you won't have much to stand on. She concurred that's the nature of the game today is to have these things in writing. It does mean longer syllabi. She has put her syllabus in a reader now which is sold over in the bookstore, so at least we're not paying for it. R. Coleman-Senghor said Stanford and Cal don't do it and he's sure they're just as concerned about money issues and again the question is what is central here. How many times do we have to publish something in order for us to be legally covered. In the catalog, which every student should have a catalog, if there's anything we should say is that you have no protection here unless you have purchased a catalog. M. Dreisbach said it is also online. B. Lahme said she understood that the catalog will only be available in electronic form in the future. Every student now is required to have an email address, correct? So wouldn't it be possible to take the plagiarism policy, diversity statement, GE statement and have certain things sent out by email and then the course specific ones required. E. McDonald said she felt that we are coddling the students to such an extent. We do have these published policies, student who have enrolled here whether they purchase a printed copy of the catalog or not should be held to a certain level of responsibility to be aware of policies on campus. If they are enrolled in a class that plagiarism policy should hold. On other campuses, she doesn't see a great deal of concern. E. Stanny said one of the reasons it's kind of short is that we did an informal survey of faculty. They didn't even want a course outline policy. Everyone wanted to do their own thing. So the more restrictions we put on them the more upset they are going to be. Everyone has the option of putting more than this, right? So we're just setting a minimum based on what we already say we're providing in the catalog. M. Dreisbach asked if the document was ready to go forward. E. Ochoa suggested reviewing it a bit more, especially the GE is a good point and also even if you added more things you could put them as recommended. He disagreed with E. McDonald. He has seem messy grievances by students that could have been easily disposed of if there had been a clear and unambiguous statement in the syllabus. E. McDonald said even in the case of plagiarism when there is a university policy and it's not in a syllabus. It seemed to her that if you're a student. . . E. Ochoa said they will grieve the nature of the punishment for example, the consequence, that's one thing to spell out. If you find somebody cheating, what are you going to do. R. McNamara said that is spelled out. We have a plagiarism policy. He feels that this is getting muddled because we have university policies and you have discretions within your syllabus, like you said absences, etc that should be spelled out, but plagiarism, we have a policy and if it's determined a student has plagiarized, there is some discretion within it, but he doesn't know if that needs to be spelled out in a syllabus, because that's really circumstantial. We do have a policy, so that surprises me that it's that's messy afterwards. E. Stanny said FSAC is happy to send this on to whatever committee would like to revise it. M. Dreisbach suggested referring it to Student Affairs and FSAC. E. Stanny asked for clarification of what FSAC should be looking at in terms of the specific comments made by the body. R. Coleman-Senghor said to note whether it is a GE course and what GE is meets. E. McDonald thought that last semester she thought we approved that the GE mission statement should be in on all GE syllabi. B. Lahme said she has one generic sentence on her syllabus saying that students are responsible to be familiar with university policies as stated in the catalog, is that sufficient? R. Coleman-Senghor said that is what he had in mind. S. Wilson asked if there is a campus-wide policy on

something like plagiarism should we have individual instructors modifying it in their own syllabi. M. Dreisbach said that's the kind of thing we can send back for consideration.

From EPC: Masters in Computer and Engineering Science program change

E. McDonald reviewed the item with the body. The MS-CES program had three plans for culminating experiences for the MS - a thesis, a design project or comprehensive exam. For various reasons, that they've laid out they are not happy with the comprehensive exam requirement and the students are not particularly happy with it either. So they propose to replace the exam with a new plan that is what they call the Lab and Technical Report Experience. How student who are taking this particular strand would finish off their experience is that they would do work on writing reports, they would learn how to operate this very complicated machinery in the new labs we have instead of taking an exam. Their rationale is that for other programs like it around the country they usually have those types of plans require at least 3 units more than the thesis and project option, so this does that. It goes up from 31 to 33. Because students are taking such different coursework, it's almost as if they have to create a different exam for every student and an issue has come up with is one exam equal to another exam. It's very challenging for them with their limited number of faculty to create different exams. They weren't happy with - was taking this exam meaningful to the student and they think that this proposed course will be invaluable technical experience for those students and will actually make them more marketable. Finally, the students actually are very happy about this proposal. We asked in EPC about the impact. So far they've only had one student so far take this track. They've only had four students graduate so far and they have several waiting that would be happy to take this track. EPC passed it unanimously. Graduate Studies also approved it unanimously. E. Ochoa asked if this was a self-support program. E. McDonald said that is the way it was approved. **No objection to putting this item on the Senate consent calendar.**

From EPC: Joint Doctoral Program in Education

E. McDonald described the proposal for a Joint Doctorate with Educational Leadership with UC Davis and Sac State. These folks have been putting this proposal together for awhile now and as you can see, it is very dense. She thought it was quite an impressive report. EPC did pass it unanimously subject to a couple of changes being made that we have documents for now, but she didn't think it could go on the consent calendar. She imagines the Senate will have quite a few questions for this program. At EPC Bob Vieth and several other people came and gave a very nice presentation that lasted around 25 minutes that summarized what the program was all about, the various agreements that have been worked out with the partnership campuses, agreements that have been worked out with our Library, and she thought perhaps that would be appropriate for that to happen at the Senate too. She didn't think she could summarize this proposal in two minutes at the Senate. In our second reading, what members of EPC asked for from this group were a couple of extra memos of understanding between the School of Education and the Joint Doctoral Program and various other entities on campus. They had already created what's in the packet here is the MOU with our Library. This is also supposed to be a

self-supporting program. They have an implementation grant from the state. They are going to be funded completely through student fees. So they have an MOU with the Library and we asked them to also come up with an MOU with IT which is the short handout you got and also an MOU between the groups and the Provost. This is just to make clear what it means for this group to be self-supporting, that no university general funds would be used to support this program. In EPC we were very impressed by the presentation. We had many, many questions. The questions we were coming up with were what any Senator would have, so we approved this with the addition of the MOU's because we figured in the Senate these questions would come up and if people could read it in advance and she thought it would be appropriate for the group to take questions from the Senators at that time. R. Coleman-Senghor said the School of Education has done quite a good job in terms of presenting this. They started on this track two years ago. They came to APC having read the Long Range Plan which discusses the question of graduate programming, but also of collaborative work with other institutions and then they had a short, brief meeting at EPC and then they came back through another cycle and through these questionings and at every point along the way they have meet the demands of the questioners and requests for more information for agreements. The basic concern we had was not with the curricular integrity of the program. That was settled by the fact that it is going to be carried through the University of California and Sacramento State as well. There is a model for it out in Fresno. Our concern was to look at the program's impact at the level of funding because it is supposed to be self-funding. What happens if you have those students, you've got them in the track, what do you do with them. So that the moral obligation of the institution to see those students from beginning to end would fall on us without regard to whether or not the funding was suddenly taken away from the program, we would still have that moral obligation, whether we would meet it or not would be another matter. He thought Education had done an excellent job of meeting the various challenges. There are questions about differential pay, about where the funding is coming from and how it would be distributed and all those questions were met. He would like to hear from the Provost if he has had the same kind of feel at the end of this process. E. Ochoa said he agreed. The program is truly self-supporting. It will generate a new revenue stream for us to cover the activities that we're involved in, so it's a win-win. E. McDonald asked the item to be moved forward to the Senate and give 30 minutes for the presentation. M. Dreisbach said she had heard from the group and that the program has been accepted at Sac State and UC Davis. **MSP to go on the Senate agenda. It was agreed that an executive summary of 3 pages would be made available in the Senate packet as well as frequently asked questions.** Hardcopies will be made available in the School of Education and the Senate office. R. Luttmann asked that the budget information be included in the Senate packet.

Resolution to Assess Faculty Confidence in the SSU Academic Senate and the SSU Administration – N. Byrne - attachment

N. Byrne introduced the item. He said you see before you a resolution to assess faculty confidence in the SSU Academic Senate and the SSU Administration. This is a resolution that way formulated by Peter Phillips. N. Byrne reviewed it and believes it has merit. The underlining premise has to do with accountability systems and also, in his belief, that the voice of the governed deserves to be heard. And of

course the two principle agents of governance on this campus are the Academic Senate and the Administration. So as you can see the resolution resolves that the SSU Academic Senate conducts a periodic survey of the SSU faculty with the purpose of evaluating faculty's confidence in the operations, performance, and decision-making processes of the SSU Academic Senate. It continues as a second resolved that the same process proceed with respect to the SSU Administration. A third resolved that the SSU Academic Senate establishes an Ad Hoc faculty committee to design an evaluation instrument to measure faculty confidence in both of these entities and that the SSU Academic Senate completes a confidence evaluation assessment of both the at a minimum of once every three years with the first assessment to occur in May of 2004. M. Dreisbach reminded the body that it is only to approve if the document is ready to go forward to the Senate.

E. Stanny asked if there was any conflict of interest of having the Academic Senate evaluate the Academic Senate? N. Byrne responded that it was a good question. But what it really asks is that the faculty of the university evaluate the Academic Senate. It is true that the evaluation instrument would be developed by the Academic Senate, particularly the ad hoc faculty committee. E. Stanny noted the last resolved clause says that the Academic Senate completes a confidence evaluation assessment of both the Academic Senate and Administration. N. Byrne said that E. Stanny's point merits discussion and advocated for the resolution to go forward and perhaps that be addressed at the Senate with whatever modification, adjustments, seem to be called for.

R. Luttmann thought it might be useful to send it to some committees before it goes to the Senate. He didn't have any particular concern or committee in mind, but this is a very new idea and we all know what happens when things get to the Senate. It's not a good place to work out details. M. Dreisbach noted there is an enabling resolution that accompanies this. It discuss the development of the ad hoc faculty committee. R. McNamara stated there are details that are not here. N. Byrne passed out a second resolution regarding setting up the ad hoc faculty committee referred to in the original resolution. M. Dreisbach noted that the by-laws do address the establishment of an ad hoc committee. The ad hoc committee consists of members appointed by the Chair and confirmed by the Executive committee and the by-laws state what needs to be in the resolution about the ad hoc committee, so we need to know the number of members, the charge and the expected completion. Apparently, they consulted that section of our by-laws and did include that information.

R. Coleman-Senghor said he meet Peter who asked him a question which was how would he feel about resolution that would raise the question of accountability for the administration and he said he would encourage it as long as the instructions would call for an assessment of the Academic Senate with respect to its effectiveness and that he would not support anything that had to do with taking the Administration in the light of an evaluation, but not looking at the evaluation of that other governance instrument, which is the Senate. That having been said, he would also say that any Senator has a right to bring any resolution forth to the body and have it discussed without necessarily have it referred to any body of faculty governance. Our question here is its readiness. If the maker believes that it is ready, and obviously he does, R. Coleman-Senghor thought we should bring it forth to the body as a resolution

brought forward by a colleague.

E. McDonald said she had a lot of questions too when she first read it about the details, how we would implement this. She added her support to with this extra resolution, it answers a lot of her questions and in this form she would support it being moved to the Senate. R. McNamara thought that the resolution on its own was not ready. He was speaking to its clarity. The second resolution makes it clearer. It seems they should be somehow blended together as a resolution. One can't pass without the other. R. Coleman-Senghor asked what R. McNamara saw that was unclear. R. McNamara said it is not clear how the Academic Senate completes a confidence assessment of both the Academic Senate and SSU Administration. That's not clear on how that's going to happen. He agreed with the conflict of interest that E. Stanny brought up. N. Byrne said his understanding was the first resolution was produced and then issues arose and therefore the second resolution was developed subsequently. It seems to him to be appropriate, if this was to go to the Senate that these be sent with the second document integrated into the first as one single resolution that would be prepared in time for the Senate agenda. R. McNamara concurred. M. Dreisbach noted that our own by-laws in Article 6 on ad hoc committees describe the establishment of ad hoc committees and says ad hoc committees shall be established by resolution of the Academic Senate. The resolution shall specify the number of members, the charge of the committee and the expected date of completion of the study or report and so without this resolution, if the first resolution went forward and passed, they would still have needed to come back with a second resolution that actually provides the details of the ad hoc committee. There is something else in Robert's Rules that could impact this as well. That has to do with dividing the motion on demand. Resolutions are supposed to be developed simply, not overly complicated. The more complicated they are then, its recommended that if there's a preamble that is not be lengthy because any one of those could stand in the way of somebody actually supporting the resolution. The resolution is really just the resolved clauses. When you have multiple issues in one resolution, any member of the Senate can require that the motion be divided on demand. Just one member saying that at the Senate would then mean that these resolves could be different issues, could be considered independently. R. Coleman-Senghor asked if that would just be the case if you had two clauses, if there's only one Whereas. . M. Dreisbach said it's not so much the Whereas as the content. It's whether or not there are multiple issues and there are multiple issues here. There is an issue of evaluating the Administration, evaluating the Academic Senate, having an ad hoc committee, developing a survey. There's many, many issues and so she's just putting that out as the Chair providing information at this point that that is something that could occur at the Senate.

R. Coleman-Senghor said we have had resolutions before us that were a lot tackier than this one. That was an impressionistic response - one that is entangled in syntactical and expressive statements that would lend to confusion. And there are statements that he does not agree with at all, but he is not the maker of the resolution and he thinks the place to fight that over is at the Senate. If the body thinks that the document is not ready, in the sense that it is a confusing series of statements, that's another matter. If it requires substantive change he would support sending it back to the maker of the resolution for changes. M. Dreisbach gave

another point of information. In her review of Robert's Rules regarding this that something that I don't believe we've followed in the past. When we do consider the resolution we consider the resolved paragraphs first and then that can be amended and voted upon and then after that we go back to the preamble and consider the preamble. We've just been summarily doing it in total in the past. R. McNamara said if the resolution goes forward as is, it is really moot if the second resolution doesn't pass. So we need to think about procedure here and how this is even going to be presented. We need to have an ad hoc committee first before you can even consider the first resolution. Is that right? He is less concern about all the whereas' and that because he thought was Robert's Rules was saying that's going to make it complicated to deal with and so be it, that's already going to withstand that challenge, but if there's some way that these could be combined, he could see that, because otherwise it's not ready.

E. Stanny said the enabling resolution is a one time resolution because the dates are so specific, it seems to her that to combine them and want it to be something that goes forward year after year, you'd want to change it so it's not April 30 , 2004 – May 2004. M. Dreisbach said whether it was the intention to have the ad hoc committee every time in the three year review, that's unclear. N. Byrne said this could be sent to the Senate with the understanding that the version provided to the Senate would incorporate these points, the specific dates, the one time existence of the ad hoc committee. R. Coleman-Senghor said he had come to the position that the body send it back to the maker of the resolution with the assurance that when this is incorporated it will be brought to the Senate at the next available meeting. There are some substantive issues both pointing out that there are specific dates here that lock us in to a one time affair when it is suggesting a cycle of review. And how these two resolutions can be integrated. Let's ask the maker of the resolution to contact M. Dreisbach for clarification on the concerns that this body had and to bring to us at our next meeting and then we can act on it. M. Dreisbach asked if that was a motion. R. Coleman-Senghor affirmed. Second. R. McNamara asked if we want to send it with specific instructions on what the concerns are? R. Coleman-Senghor said yes, that why he referred it to M. Dreisbach to take it to the maker of the resolution with the concerns stated by various members of this body. R. McNamara noted that the resolution seemed to be pointing to a permanent committee instead of an ad hoc committee. R. Coleman-Senghor said yes, that's a substantive issue. R. McNamara asked if that would part of the communication that you would have with the maker of the resolution because that's where he thinks we're going to get into a bind on this. M. Dreisbach said it was the author's choice to do this through an ad hoc rather than a standing committee so these are details that they would have to decide. If that's what the body wants her to do, reinforced by the minutes, she will bring the issues. R. Coleman-Senghor said that the thinks the important thing to show them here is that there is a conflict between the notion of an ad hoc committee being called for and a committee that will in effect address this issue of an on-going process. E. McDonald said that when she looks at the resolved clause that is the charge to the ad hoc committee, it is simply to design the instrument, which could be interpreted as a one time event, so she's was not sure whether there was any confusion when it was written whether this was going to be a one time committee or an on-going committee. M. Dreisbach said or if this was to be the design of an instrument that is used for the first time in May and the same instrument used every three years. E.

McDonald said she thought that was clear as written. E. Stanny asked also who is going to collect all the results and tabulate the data, is that the ad hoc committee?
Vote on motion to refer resolutions back to the maker with input from the chair regarding the concerns of the Executive Committee based on our discussion as it appears on the minutes. Passed on voice vote.

Senate Agenda

Agreement to postpone Green Music Center presentation

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes - 2/5/04 emailed

From EPC: Change in MS-CES program

BUSINESS

1. Resolutions regarding Lecturers:

a. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3.10 of By-Laws; Replacement of Lecturer Senators – First Reading – attachment – M. Dreisbach

b. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3 of By-Laws regarding election of Lecturer Senators - First Reading - attachment - M. Dreisbach

2. Grants and Contracts Policy – First Reading – E. Stanny – attachment

3. Draft Vision and Mission statement from AASPC – First Reading - C. Nelson – attachment

4. Joint Doctoral Program in Education – First Reading – B. Vieth

EPC report

E. McDonald had one item to bring to the body. EPC really needs to get going on a protocol for a full program review process. We've spent the last two years doing these interim program reviews and we've learned a lot from that process and we'd like to take the existing program review from the past and see what needs to remain what can change from that. What she wants to do at the next EPC meeting is to create a program review task force that would include members of the university that would have some kind of interest in this program review process. That would probably include Carlos Benito, who said he was interested. She believed Elaine Sundberg would be on it from the Provost's office. Campus Climate has indicated an interest in having a say in it. She imagines APC might be interested, GE might be interested, she wanted to have this discussion in the meeting to create this charge to a task force for the program review process. Our goal is to have the task force put in place by next week, have them start looking at the process, be able to say

something to WASC when they come, and to actually have a program in place by the end of the semester so that we can start regular program reviews next year. Elaine Sundberg said she would at least accumulate a list of different programs on campus that have made requests that they would like to have a full program review earlier than later to start prioritizing the schedule that would happen. That's what EPC is embarking on next week and she appreciated any input from the body.

R. Luttmann asked that Advising be on the task force. B. Lahme noted that in the Advising policy it says that advising should be part of the program review and we did a survey of faculty chairs and Deans and it turns out that either nobody is doing it or not yet maybe at some point, there's really nothing in place to include that so that would definitely one point that needs to be addressed. R. Coleman-Senghor thought FSAC should be involved because there has been an on-going discussion of the role of advisement in the RTP process. We look at people who are engaged in faculty service and downplay advising and especially the role of advising vis-à-vis preparing our newer faculty, when they should come in and whether or not their advising training should be part of their review process. E. McDonald questioned if that would play a role in the program review. R. Coleman-Senghor argued it would in terms of whether or not the program has some way of assuring for or accounting for advising in its operations. E. McDonald said perhaps she was confusing issues. She could understand the point of view that part of the assessment should be an assessment of their advising process, but she was not sure that a department's protocol should be valued in a person's RTP. R. Coleman-Senghor said that was an interesting question – how those things are integrated. R. Luttmann reiterated that advising definitely needs to be involved in the assessment process for programs. E. McDonald said she thought instead of having an SSP involved, this should be a faculty driven process because these are academic programs, so perhaps somebody from SAC would be appropriate to play that advising role rather than someone from advising. B. Lahme said she thought ESAS would be happy with that actually, if faculty took a more active role in advising issues. That's the feedback she's been getting.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom